Applicants hereby elect the claims of **Group I**, with traversal because it is clear from a previous Office Action that claims 1 to 7 have already been searched together and, except for a few objections, were indicated as allowable.

On September 22, 2004, a first Office Action was mailed ("the September 22, 2004 Action"). The September 22, 2004 Action included a rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and two objections directed to claim 2. Otherwise, the September 22, 2004 Action, at page 3, clearly indicated that "[c]laims 1, 3, 4, and 6 [were] ***allowable***" (emphasis added). Such determination of allowability can only imply that the claims have already been searched – together.

Regarding Groups I and III, the Action asserts that the claims in each group are "distinct" (Action at 2), however, all of the claims in each Group have already been searched together and were determined to be "allowable" (with the exception of claim 7) (September 22, 2004 Action at 3). Moreover, Applicants note that each of Groups I and III have been classified in the ***same class*** – Class 546.

Regarding Groups I and II, the Action asserts that it "is too burdensome ... to search all of the previously noted searches in their respective, completely divergent, areas for the non-elected subject matter, as well, in the limited time provided to search one invention" Action at 3). But, in view of the September 22, 2004 indication that claim belong to each of Groups I and II were allowable, Applicants do not understand how it could be so "burdensome" to conduct a search for each Group; indeed it appears that the search was already performed prior to the mailing of the September 22, 2004 Action. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement are requested respectfully.